

**Citizens Advisory Committee  
Intermodal Passenger Subcommittee  
Meeting Minutes – 6/2/08**

The meetings was called to order at 10:10 AM

The meeting was attended by Gretchen Driskell, Sylvester Payne, and Linda Miller Atkinson (via conference call). Due to phone problems, Linda Miller Atkinson was not able to participate on all agenda items.

Opportunity was given for public comment at the beginning and end of the meeting, but no public comment was made.

**Meeting Summary**

Sharon Edgar (MDOT – BPT) provided an overview to the Intermodal Passenger Subcommittee on the “Current, Good, Better” scenarios for Intercity Bus, Intercity/Interstate Passenger Rail, Transit Operating, and Transit Capital programs. In addition, Niles Annelin provided an overview of the Carpool Lot program and Josh DeBruyn provided an overview of the Estimate of Needs for Non-motorized (Please note that the MDOT trunkline portion was covered in the Roads and Bridge report).

**Discussion**

Ms. Driskell wanted to know if there were any opportunities to work with regional transit planning agencies for Intercity Bus Services. (Yes) Further discussion ensued on defining the costs of doing nothing and relating these costs on how they would impact the citizenry.

Relating to the Intercity Passenger Rail Program, Mr. Payne recommended that the narrative include information that clarifies Michigan’s limited role to effect change on this issue. Expansion of rail services is a region-wide issue and will require other states to make improvements in conjunction with Michigan to be effective. (Caveat: Projecting future needs for Intercity Passenger Rail programs is difficult, as it is unclear what programs or resource will be available, if any, in the future. Currently, there is no dedicated federal revenue source and only a limited amount of federal revenue available for capital.)

The Subcommittee requested that the MDOT be consistent on federal match requirement assumptions. MDOT concurred, but pointed out that it was not clear what future federal match requirements would be when SAFETEA LU is reauthorized. (Note: Federal rail reauthorization is separate from SAFETEA LU.) Ms. Driskell recommended that the narrative include information on what the lost opportunities would be due to the lack of federal funding match.

The Subcommittee expressed concern relating to the 86% increase for Transit Operating under the Good Scenario. Specifically, Ms. Driskell wanted to know if the industry (Local Transit Agencies) could help provide additional details to help clarify what this funding would be used for and why this additional funding is needed. The Subcommittee is concerned that this huge increase would not be understood by the other CAC Subcommittees/TF2. Mr. Payne stated that he would attempt to get information from the “Westside” (Kalamazoo) to help clarify and give context to this scenario.

Ms. Driskell requested whether MDOT could summarize the scenarios into a one-pager and to provide more information that encapsulates costs and how the flow of revenues works for the transit programs. (Sharon mentioned that we need to ensure that we do not lose sight of the federal funds as well.)

Relating to the Carpool Lots program, Ms. Driskell requested more information on how we could get more dollars leverage for this program and whether the match rate assumptions need to be amended from 50% to 25%. It was agreed that the match rate would be reduced to 25%.

Mr. Payne stated that under the Current/Good/Better scenarios for Non-motorized, we need to address the deterioration of the current system and the associated maintenance costs.

The Subcommittee questioned the best way to integrate both the Carpool Lot program and the Non-motorized since both are touched briefly in the Road and Bridge report. The Subcommittee agreed the detail and narrative belongs with the Intermodal Passenger report, but care needs to be taken to not double count the figures.

The meeting adjourned at 12:20 PM